

than later if you want them to be considered, otherwise they will not be fully considered and will go down the drain most likely.

Mr. President, I also want to mention and give tremendous credit to the Senator from Virginia, Senator WARNER, chairman of the transportation subcommittee of our full committee. He has worked very, very hard. He has many, many responsibilities around here with everything under the Sun, frankly, yet he has diligently, with his staff, worked to come up with this compromise, and I might say, also, with tremendous grace and style and class. And it has been a real pleasure to work with the Senator from Virginia.

In addition, we are here today in large part, Mr. President, because of the efforts of Senator BYRD, from West Virginia, and Senator GRAMM, from Texas. There was a problem as to whether—we did not know whether we were going to get this bill up before the budget bill. But Senators BYRD and GRAMM have offered an amendment. It is very simple. The amendment is not before us now. It is part of the matrix of this whole highway bill.

It is a very simple amendment which says, essentially, of the 4.3 cents of Federal gasoline taxes, which we last year transferred from general revenue into the highway trust fund, that money should also be spent back on highway programs, at least that portion dedicated to highways.

That is the amendment. And because of that amendment, and because of the urgency of making sure that our motorists in our States get what they pay in taxes, we are here now today, before the budget resolution is before us, and again it is Senator BYRD and Senator GRAMM who in large part are responsible, in addition to the leader and Senator WARNER and others as to why we are here.

So I close, Mr. President, because I see my good friend, Senator WARNER, standing over here ready to speak. And I thank him for what he has done.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague. And indeed the Senator from Montana and I have been partners on this throughout. There was a time when it was just the two of us together. And we stood steadfast and put together the basic coalition of States that gave us the nucleus of concepts and ideas which were incorporated in the subcommittee bill, of which I am privileged to chair and the distinguished Senator from Montana is not only ranking on the full committee but he is ranking on the subcommittee that drew up this bill.

I thank him because there were some lonely days in the course of the development of this bill, and we stood together as we have throughout. He has quite properly acknowledged the important contributions of Senator BYRD and Senator PHIL GRAMM of Texas. And we have been meeting together with the distinguished majority leader, the chairman of the Budget Committee,

chairman CHAFEE, Chairman D'AMATO, as we try to work through a solution to the timing and the presentation of that amendment.

So, Mr. President, I want to give a statement on behalf of the bill. But two of our colleagues have time constraints, and if it is agreeable to the distinguished floor manager here on the Democrat side, I would like to yield at this point in time the floor such that these Senators can get recognition and do their important work.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUTCHINSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might proceed as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I would also like to add my commendation to the distinguished Senator from Virginia for his outstanding leadership on the ISTE II bill and on his commitment to the infrastructure of this country. It has been my privilege in my first year in the Senate to serve with Senator WARNER on the Environment and Public Works Committee, and it has been an honor indeed to see his commitment to improving the infrastructure of this Nation and his willingness to work with me on our particular needs in my home State. I commend you for your leadership.

(The remarks of Mr. HUTCHINSON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1684, S. 1685, and S. 1686 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THOMPSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes for the purpose of introducing legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The remarks of Mr. THOMPSON pertaining to the introduction of S. 1687 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes as if in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX MORATORIUM ON INTERNET TRANSACTIONS

Mr. GREGG. Mr. President, the administration comes in for a fair amount of criticism from our side of the aisle, and I think most of it is well directed. So when they do something that is positive and which is, in my opinion, proper policy, it should also be acknowledged.

The administration's decision today, the White House decision, the decision of the President, as presented by the President's people at Treasury, Deputy Secretary Summers, to put in place a moratorium, or send up legislation to put in place a moratorium on any tax relative to transactions over the Internet which States might try to assess is the absolute right decision.

I know that the Governors of the different States were in Washington this week, and that they made one of their priorities the ability to assess a tax on transactions which occur over the Internet. That is wrong. The Internet is obviously the last Wild West of American and world entrepreneurship. It is an explosive technology of which, as we all know, we have only seen the tip of the iceberg.

I can't think of any quicker way to retard that explosion of technology, creativity, entrepreneurship, and the prosperity which will arise from it, than to create a hodgepodge of taxation across this country assessed against the Internet by each State. I can't think of anything that would have a more chilling effect on the capacity of people using the Internet to participate in transactions involving commercial sales than if they were subjected to a tax policy which would vary from border to border, and probably within States from community to community.

This would definitely undermine the condition in which the Internet has become one of the more effective ways that this Nation markets its products, not only within the United States but internationally. It would also undermine our capacity as a Nation to speak to other countries in this world which might be considering putting a tax on the Internet or Internet transactions, which would create a waterfall effect as other nations tried to join into it. It would be truly not only a bad example, it would end up being an incredibly bad policy for our Nation as a world leader in the area of technology. So the White House has chosen the right course here.

I recognize that for years many of the Governors have sought the ability to tax interstate sales which occur through the mails. The *Bellas Hess* case has been the law of the land, which says that is not something that States can do and that the catalog companies that are based around the Nation, when they sell through the catalogs, are not subject in many instances to the sales taxes of the local States. I happen to think that is also the correct policy, but I recognize that many of the Governors do not.

However, if they have a grievance with the issue that addresses the sales through catalogs, then that issue should be separated and settled independent of the Internet, and that issue should be settled first before we move into the Internet. They should not use taxation of transactions over the Internet as an attempt to leverage the issue of taxing catalog sales across the country, and that is basically what the goal of the Governors was here. They obviously cared about the Internet tax policy, but they were more interested in trying to get the catalog sale issue, which is a much bigger item right now—maybe not in the future, but right now—for these States.

But in trying to do that, the Governors have, unfortunately—and speaking as a former Governor, I say that with genuine regret—pursued a policy which is wrong. Added taxes are not a good idea in most instances anyway, but added taxes which would be assessed across this country in all sorts of different varieties against the Internet transactions would undermine, as I mentioned, one of the great entrepreneurial issues, certainly in the latter half of this century and potentially as we go into the next century, for the beginning of the next century.

I congratulate the White House for its decision to send up to the Congress a moratorium on any taxes which might be assessed by States against the Internet. I will strongly support that moratorium. I look forward to prompt action on it.

I yield back my time and make a point of order a quorum is not present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INTERMODAL SURFACE TRANSPORTATION EFFICIENCY ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I am relieved, as are many of my colleagues, that the highway reauthorization bill is now on the floor of the Senate. I compliment the Senate majority leader, Senator LOTT, for bringing this piece of legislation, which is so important to this country, to the floor for debate. Not only do I compliment and thank the Senate majority leader, I thank publicly the Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, Senator BAUCUS from Montana, Senator BYRD from West Virginia, Senator GRAMM from Texas, and so many others who have come to the floor of the Senate and who, prior to that time, have worked in the committees and subcommittees to produce a piece of legislation that I think is a very good and very important for this country.

Again, I express my appreciation to all of those folks who I think have crafted a bill that continues to understand that roads and highways represent a national priority and represent a national need.

There are some things in this country that we don't describe as a national need or a national priority. We decide that these are things that State and local governments make decisions on individually around the country. But there are some things that are national in scope. We decided some long while ago that if we were to be a world-class economy, we must have a first-class infrastructure, and we must have a nationwide network of roads over which we can move commerce and trade back and forth across the country. Roads that we can be proud of, roads that we keep maintained through the investment that we make in legislation like this.

The difficulty that we have had over the years in constructing a highway program has been a disagreement among the various States about who should get what, and how much money should go to one State versus another for the investment in the infrastructure of roads and bridges.

In the Senate, we have now constructed a piece of legislation that I think has an awfully good formula. It is a compromise, a compromise that has been worked out by not only Senator WARNER and Senator BAUCUS, but Senator CHAFEE and so many others. This compromise, in my judgment, is fair and makes a great deal of sense for this country.

It is my hope that the Senate, now having this piece of legislation on the floor, will move expeditiously to offer amendments, to consider amendments and get final passage. And then, hopefully, persuade the other body to do the same so that we can get to a conference and finally adopt a conference report on this important legislation.

I am going to be offering an amendment, perhaps two amendments. I will not offer them at this moment, but I want to describe one of the amendments that I will offer to this piece of legislation.

Not only is it important that we have good highways and good roads in this country, it is important that the roads be safe. This legislation deals with safety standards; it deals with highway safety programs and the investment necessary to educate the American people and to provide assistance to the States in that education process.

One of the issues of safety in our country is the issue of drinking and driving. It is interesting that if you ask the question, "Have you been touched or affected, do you have a relative or an acquaintance that you know who has been killed by a drunk driver?" almost every American will raise their hand and say, "Yes, I know someone who has been killed by a drunk driver."

Every 30 minutes in this country someone else dies on this Nation's

roads because of a drunk driver. Someone who took a drink, and then took a car out on a public highway and caused a death. Every 30 minutes another American dies on our roads because of drunk driving.

My family has experienced that tragedy twice. The call that I received, like the calls that so many other Americans have received, to tell me that my mother had been killed by a drunk driver is a moment that I will never forget.

My mother was driving home from a hospital at 9 o'clock in the evening in Bismarck, ND, traveling at about 25 miles an hour, about 4 blocks from home, and a drunk driver in a pickup truck, being pursued by the police, according to eyewitnesses, at about 80 to 100 miles per hour, on a city street, hit my mother's car. She was killed instantly.

It took a long, long time for me to overcome the anger that I felt about that. I still today think of not only what a tragedy it was for our family to lose such a wonderful woman, but every time I pick up a newspaper and read a story or watch the television or listen to the radio news about another death on our highways caused by drunk drivers, stop when I hear it and understand again what a tragic, tragic thing it is. This not some mysterious disease for which we do not have a cure. We understand what causes these deaths. And we understand how to stop it.

This country does not, regrettably, view drunk driving as do some other countries in the world. In Europe, if you drink and drive and are picked up under the influence of alcohol, the penalties are so severe that you don't want to think about them. So almost inevitably in Europe, whenever several people are out drinking, one person is not drinking because that is the person who drives. You cannot afford to drink and drive in some European countries.

In this country, regrettably, for a long while, when someone was picked up for drunk driving, someone else would give them a knowing grin and a slap on the back, and say, "That's OK, Charlie." Well, it is not OK. Organizations have developed in this country—Mothers Against Drunk Driving, and others—who began to raise an awareness, State by State, on these issues, that the carnage on American roads does not have to continue.

But do you know that, despite all of the work that has been done and despite all of the efforts in the States, in the cities, and here in the U.S. Congress; do you know that there are States in this country where you can put one hand on the neck of a whiskey bottle and you can put your other hand on a set of car keys? You can slip behind the wheel of that car, put the key in, start the engine and drive off and drink from that whiskey bottle, and you are still perfectly legal?

There are still States in this country, nearly a half a dozen of them, that do not prohibit drinking and driving. It is